

**Draft Summary of the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
July 28, 2003**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group on July 28, 2003 in Sacramento.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Fuel Load Management Evaluation, Interim Report
Attachment 4	Land Use Resource Action Matrix
Attachment 5	Draft Schedule for Plenary and Work Group Meetings (November 2003 – December 2004)

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group (LUWG) meeting, including several people who participated via videoconference. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations. The LUWG reviewed the desired outcomes of the meeting. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively.

Review of Plenary Group Activities and Action Items – June 23, 2003 Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group Meeting

A summary of the June 23, 2003 LUWG meeting is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

- Action Item #LU60:** Answer questions sent by DPR staff pertaining to the grazing lease. Report back to the Work Group at the July Work Group meeting (follow-up action item).
- Status:** This action item is a follow up to the discussion on grazing from the June LUWG meeting. Representatives from DPR and DWR have held discussions on this issue since the last meeting and agreed that the best course of action is to arrange for a field inspection of the grazing lease area and talk over specific issues on the site. DPR has requested that DWR conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the effects of cattle grazing in the project area. Jim Martin, DWR Land Use Resource Area Manager will take the lead to set up the field visit and will update the LUWG on its results.
- Action Item #LU65:** Distribute the interim report for SP-L5 (Fuel Load Management) in advance of the July LUWG meeting (follow-up action item).
- Status:** A copy of the interim report for SP-L5 (Fuel Load Management) was distributed to the LUWG in advance of the July LUWG meeting. In addition, hard copies of the report were distributed at the meeting (Attachment 3).
- Action Item #LU67:** Discuss the fuel load liability issue raised by DPR with Ward Tabor (DWR) and report back to the LUWG at the next LUWG meeting.
- Status:** Jim Martin spoke with DWR legal staff Ward Tabor about the fuel load liability issues raised by DPR. DWR's legal department is researching this issue further and will report back at the next LUWG meeting.

- Action Item #LU68:** Send hard copy and electronic copies of the draft Land Use PM&E matrix to Work Group participants.
- Status:** The Facilitator distributed copies of the Land Use PM&E matrix to LUWG participants in mid-July. The matrix was discussed in detail as part of a subsequent agenda item (See below).
- Action Item #LU69:** Review the PM&E matrix; confirm that the resource actions are characterized correctly, and begin filling out the matrix.
- Status:** This action item was to be completed by the LUWG participants. The matrix was discussed in detail as part of a subsequent agenda item (See below).

The Plenary Group will meet on July 29, 2003 and discuss compliance issues with members of FERC staff, specifically in the context of FERC's enforcement process for relicensing projects. The Plenary Group will also discuss deadlines for the environmental document and anticipated work group products.

Study Implementation Update

The Consultant Team provided an update on all five Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics study plans to the LUWG. Mapping for the various studies were available for review at the meeting.

SP-L1 (Land Use)

Land use and land ownership mapping for the Land Use study is being revised based on comments provided by DWR. Once the mapping is finalized and text revised accordingly, an interim report for SP-L1 will be made available to the LUWG for review.

SP-L2 (Land Management)

Mapping is also underway that illustrates management prescriptions in the study area, including zoning information from Butte County. This effort involves coordination with the various public agencies that manage lands in the study area. Nancy Bird with EDAW will be meeting with agency representatives in person to discuss management issues. This study is also currently ahead of schedule.

SP-L3 (Comprehensive Plan Consistency)

Copies of the L3 interim report were provided to various agencies for review. The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) noted that one of their plans was missing and provided it to the consultant team for inclusion in the report. The plan was added, summarized, and the report was sent back to the RWQCB to confirm that the new plan was characterized correctly. New plans can be added to the report as appropriate. One LUWG participant asked whether Bulletin 250 (Fish Passage Plan) should be included in this report. This bulletin is currently in draft form and the timeframe for its completion is not known. Jim Martin will e-mail the draft version of this bulletin to the consultant team for review. Another participant indicated that the Central Valley Joint Venture Migratory Bird Treaty Act also should be included in L3.

SP-L4 (Aesthetics)

Mark Greenig with EDAW is waiting for pool elevation frequency data from DWR for inclusion in L4.

SP-L5 (Fuel Load Management)

The Fuel Load Management Evaluation, Interim Report for L5 has been completed and was distributed to the LUWG for review. It was reiterated that the evaluation followed the outline provided in the study plan and is not intended to serve as a fuel load management plan. Chapter 7 of the evaluation represents recommendations or guidelines based on local experts and should not be construed as management prescriptions. Woody Elliot representing Department of Parks and

Recreation, (DPR) indicated that DPR would prefer that a fuel load management plan be developed for the project area, specifically addressing the urban/wildland interface; DPR intends to propose a resource action for a comprehensive Vegetation Management Plan which would include fuel load management considerations.

The LUWG discussed the absence of any Kelly Ridge residents at the LUWG meetings and it was suggested that more outreach is needed. DPR currently has an evolving policy on fuel load issues, which is documented in L5. The California Department of Forestry (CDF) administers programs in the project area for local landowners related to fuel load issues such as fire working groups (or fire councils); currently, there is no fire council for the Kelly Ridge area. Woody Elliot requested that requirements for fuel breaks around houses be added to the L5 report. He agreed to send the local regulations related "defensible space" to DWR for consideration.

Jim Martin reiterated that all interim reports should be considered draft and all comments should be sent to him and he will forward them to the appropriate people.

PM&E Development

A revised PM&E matrix for the LUWG was distributed to Work Group participants (see Attachment 4). This matrix follows the model developed by other work groups. There is a need to identify potential resource actions so that they can be analyzed in the Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment (PDEA). The Land Use matrix started with the Issue Tracker and was expanded and revised by DWR as appropriate. The action item for the LUWG was to review the resource actions and confirm that DWR's interpretation of them was appropriate and accurate.

The Facilitator explained the approach suggested by the Environmental Work Group (EWG) for categorizing resource actions. The EWG is currently organizing their resource actions (RA) into four categories: (1) RA is complete and ready for more detailed evaluation by the PDEA team – usually means at least a Resource Action Information Form has been completed for the action; (2) waiting for study plan data results; (3) needs new information not included in existing studies (may include adaptive management strategy or basic science development); and (4) not recommended for further analysis either because it is redundant to another RA, not realistic concept, or not a quantifiable problem. The Facilitator noted that the Plenary Group at their July meeting would review these categories.

It was noted that those resource actions that come in sooner would receive more analysis based on timing constraints. It is expected that some resource actions will begin moving from the work groups to environmental review in September 2003.

The LUWG reviewed the specific resource actions included in the matrix. It was noted that some RAs might contradict each other but would be evaluated separately. LWG-1 is dependent on the recreation demand study and was identified as Category 2. The LUWG agreed that LWG-2 should be divided into two separate RAs, one focused on an open space program and one on a vegetation management plan. The LUWG discussed possible constraints to removal of debris under LWG-3. LWG-4 is the BLM land transfer proposal, which would eliminate BLM holdings from the project area; this RA would not constitute a fee-title transfer of ownership due to reverter clauses. It is still unclear whether the land exchange will proceed in or out of the FERC process. The LUWG categorized LWG-5 as a Category 4 RA because it was considered infeasible to create private in-holdings in the project area; leases would be more appropriate. Surplus properties outside of the FERC boundary could be sold, but that is not a relicensing issue. The LUWG suggested that LWG-6 be moved to the Environmental Work Group and requested Andy Atkinson with Department of Fish and Game (DFG) to follow-up with CDF regarding LWG-7. The LUWG discussed a number of RAs that could be combined into one. DWR and consulting staff will revised the matrix based on the input from the participants to consolidate LWG-8 and 10 and LWG-

9, 11, 12, and 3. The LUWG discussed the O&M associated with LWG-13 and the relatively small benefit provided by the RA and placed it in Category 4. The intent of LWG-14 is unclear and will require additional information before consideration. LWG-15 represents a native plant landscape approach to future facility development and is different than the Vegetation Management Plan, LWG-2b.

Several RAs were missing from the matrix and will be added during the next revision including: (1) additional funding and staffing at the OWA; (2) screening/planting adjacent to the Afterbay levee; and (3) removal of billboard along Highway 99. A placeholder will be included in the matrix for the grazing issue. The Facilitator will re-send a revised matrix to the LUWG prior to the next meeting that includes the revisions discussed at the meeting, a new column for "category", and an initial attempt to complete the matrix cells. The next meeting will focus on categorizing (or prioritizing) the revised resource action list.

Next Meeting and Next Steps

The next Land Use, LUWG meeting will be:

Date: Monday, August 25, 2003
Time: 6:00 PM to 10:00 PM
Location: Oroville

The Facilitator distributed the future Collaborative meeting schedule through December 2004 (see Attachment 5).

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the LUWG includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

Action Item #LU67: Report back to the Work Group regarding DWR's research into the fuel load liability issue (follow-up action item).

Responsible: Jim Martin (DWR)
Due Date: August 25, 2003

Action Item #LU70: Arrange for field visit between DWR and DPR staff to discuss grazing issues in the project area, and report back to the Work Group.

Responsible: Jim Martin (DWR)
Due Date: August 25, 2003

Action Item #LU71: E-mail draft version of Bulletin 250 (Fish Passage Plan) to consultant team for possible inclusion in SP-L3.

Responsible: Jim Martin (DWR)
Due Date: August 25, 2003

Action Item #LU72: Follow-up with CDF regarding intent of Resource Action LWG-7.

Responsible: Andy Atkinson (CDFG)
Due Date: August 25, 2003

Action Item #LU73: Re-send a revised matrix to the LUWG prior to the next meeting that includes the revisions discussed at the meeting, a new column for "category", and an initial attempt to complete the matrix cells.

Responsible: Facilitator
Due Date: Prior to August 25, 2003